

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,644	10/23/2003	Katsuhiko Yoshida	244230US-2S CONT	9147
22850	7590 03/27/2006		EXAM	INER
•	•	ID, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.	NGUYEN, CHAU N	
	1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2831	
			DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		(10/690,644	YOSHIDA ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Chau N. Nguyen	2831
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			·
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 M</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Applicati	ion Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the example Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2.	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
	·		
2)  Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/690,644

Art Unit: 2831

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Withdrawal of Finality

The finality of the rejection of the last Office action is hereby withdrawn due to the new ground of rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

  Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/690,644

Art Unit: 2831

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (6,242,825) in view of Ford (2,320,922).

Mori et al. discloses a coil for an electric rotating machine (Fig. 4) comprising a conductor configured by bundling a plurality of square strands and stacking the square strands like a coil with Roebel transposition, a mica tape (Fig. 5) which is wound a plurality of layers around on an outer surface of the conductor and made up a mica paper (31) and a cloth backing material (32), an insulation layer formed with impregnating and curing resin (col. 7, lines 51-55) between the wound layers of the mica tape, inorganic particles (col. 8, lines 1-9) supported with the mica tape using an adhesive comprising a first component having mutual dissolubility with the impregnating resin (col. 8, lines 14-43).

Mori et al. does not specifically disclose the adhesive containing a glue insoluble in the impregnated resin (re claims 1, 2, 13, 16). Ford discloses high voltage coil insulation comprising an adhesive composition containing a glue insoluble in a dielectric material, wherein the glue is polyvinyl alcohol or polyvinyl acetal (page 2, col. 1, lines 37-74) (re claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 11). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the glue component as taught by Ford in the adhesive of Mori et al. to secure the inorganic particles of Mori et al. within the mica tape and to bond the turns of the mica tape to each other.

Mori et al. also discloses the inorganic particles including aluminum nitride (re claim 6), aluminum oxide (re claims 14 and 17), or boron nitride (re claims 15 and 18). Re claims 4, 5, 8, 10 and 12, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose a suitable amount of polyvinyl-based polymer or polyvinyl alcohol in the adhesive, including 0.5wt% to 5wt%, to meet the specific use of the resulting tape since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection except for the following.

In response to applicant's argument that Ford does not disclose that the adhesive contains two components, the Ford reference is relied upon only to support the position of using an adhesive which is insoluble in a dielectric material (a resin) to hold the particles within the impregnating resin, therefore Ford does not have to disclose the adhesive containing two components.

## Summary

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/690,644

Art Unit: 2831

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2831

Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831